REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 9 August 2006. Responsive to the rejections made by the Examiner in the Office Action, Independent Claim 1 has been further amended.

In the Office Action, Claims 1 – 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner made an observation that the claimed "pre-designated configuration space settings" found in Claim 1 (in lines 1, 2, 4, and 12) is not clearly defined in the Specification and this terminology is not found within the Specification. Further, Claims 1 – 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, it is not clear to the Examiner whether the Applicant is attempting to claim testing the memory space allotted to store the configuration settings or testing of the actual configuration settings. The clarification was required in order to properly examine the case.

It is respectfully submitted, that the purpose of the method of the present invention is to avoid errors in the testing procedure which may be associated with deviation of the physical configuration space defined in the chip under the test from the configuration space settings defining the physical configuration space, as

clearly presented in the "Background" section of the subject Patent Application. The prior chip testing procedure fails to verify the correspondence between the physical configuration space on the chip under test and configuration space settings designed for this particular chip. If there is a disagreement between the actual configuration space on the chip and the configuration space settings, the functionality of the tested chip will differ from the intended functionality. In this scenario the testing procedure is applied to the "wrong" chip. Therefore, the test will result in false output data. To trace back the key problem of such chips is a lengthy and complex process which is disadvantageous as to extensive time being lost in the tracing process.

In order to overcome the deficiency of the prior art chip testing, the present invention test procedure includes the operation of verification of the correspondence of the actual configuration space defined on the chip under test to configuration space settings in accordance with which the chip must be manufactured prior to the chip testing.

The configuration space settings, as readily available to a person skilled in the art, clearly falls under the category of "pre-designated" settings as the configuration space settings are designed and recorded prior to formation of the chip and definitely prior to subjecting the chip to the testing procedure. However, the terminology "pre-designated configuration space settings" was not clearly defined in the specification in the Examiner's opinion. The terminology "pre-

"pre-designated" has been deleted from the claim language without disclaiming the subject matter or of narrowing the scope of protection afforded in Independent Claim 1.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a method for testing configuration space settings of a chip and includes the following limitations (inter alia):

"… the chip having a configuration space defined therein …

providing a BIOS program including a configuration space setting test process therein …

… executing said configuration space setting test process to verify correspondence of said configuration space defined in said chip to the configuration space settings of said chip".

The claimed subject matter is clearly defined in the Specification and the corresponding terminology can be found within the Specification. It is believed, that by the Amendment to Claim 1, the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, rejection has been obviated.

With regard to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection, it is believed that Claim 1, as amended, clearly emphasizes that the chip under the test is subjected to the testing procedure which tests whether the actual (or physical) configuration space defined on the chip under the test is in agreement with the configuration space settings for this particular chip. It is believed that Claim 1, as amended, is definite as particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject

matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection is obviated.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Applicant believes that the subject Patent Application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
For: ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

Morton J. Rosenberg
Registration #26,049

Dated: 8 November 2006

Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678
Customer No. 04586